



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/756,773	01/14/2004	Tomoaki Endo	03500.013745.1	2334
5514	7590	04/01/2009		
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO			EXAMINER	
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			WASHINGTON, JAMARES	
NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/01/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/756,773	Applicant(s) ENDO ET AL.
	Examiner JAMARES WASHINGTON	Art Unit 2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 69-91 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 69-91 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/1648) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 23, 2009 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

Amendments and response received January 23, 2009 have been entered. Claims 69-91 are pending in this application. Claims 69, 72, 79, 82 and 89 have been amended. Claims 90 and 91 have been added. Amendments and response are addressed hereinbelow.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "issuance unit" as described, for example in claim 69, must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered. According to the original specification, job issuance is performed by a user

using “the pointing device 6004 to select the manager as a data transmission target” as explained in ¶ [288] wherein the “printer driver 505” conducts the issuance of the print job (¶ [287]. However, the printer driver is merely software (control program) and cannot be seen as an actual physical “issuance unit” per se. Further clarification is required in future correspondence.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claim 79 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. While the claims recite a series of steps or acts to be performed, a

Art Unit: 2625

statutory “process” under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to another statutory category (such as a particular apparatus), or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing (Reference the May 15, 2008 memorandum issued by Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examining Policy, John J. Love, titled “Clarification of ‘Processes’ under 35 U.S.C. 101” – publicly available at USPTO.GOV, “memorandum to examining corp”). The instant claims neither transform underlying subject matter nor positively tie to another statutory category that accomplishes the claimed method steps, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process. In order for a process to be “tied” to another statutory category, the structure of another statutory category should be positively recited in a step or steps significant to the basic inventive concept, and NOT just in association with statements of intended use or purpose, insignificant pre or post solution activity, or implicitly.

In order to be “tied-to” another statutory category, structure associated with another statutory category must be positively recited in a step or steps significant to the basic inventive concept.

- Structure in statements of intended use or purpose, whether in the claim or preamble, is NOT SUFFICIENT.
- Structure recited as part of insignificant pre and post solution activity is NOT SUFFICIENT (insignificant to the basic inventive concept).
- The other statutory category must be “positively” recited in the claim, NOT IMPLIED by the claim. Examiner cannot read structure from the specification into the claim.

The basic idea is that a process must be tied to something real (i.e., another statutory category), and not be an idea or concept separated from or floating above or apart from real

things. The gap needs to be bridged between a separated floating idea or concept and something real (i.e., another statutory category).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 69-71, 73, 75-81, 83 and 85-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yousef R. Yacoub (6552813 B2) in view of Albert Aiello, Jr. et al (US 6337745 B1).

Regarding claim 69, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus (Fig. 5 numeral 600 client station) for controlling via a communication medium (Fig. 5 numeral 650 network) a peripheral (Fig. 5 numeral 660 or 670, printers) that processes a job, which executes a predetermined service, the apparatus comprising:

an obtaining unit adapted to obtain (Fig. 5 numeral 610 virtual printer via numeral 620 network interface), via the communication medium (Fig. 5 network 650, communication medium), function information that includes information indicating plural setting values executable by the peripheral ("Virtual printer 610 receives other data, from the server 680 or a database in client 600, such as the capabilities of the printers so that the virtual printer can find

the most appropriate printer, one that complies with the user's print job preferences" at Col. 11 line 46. Information regarding the capabilities of the printers reads on information indicating plural setting values as each function has to be given a value indicating it's capability to perform or a value indicating the function cannot be performed); and
an inhibition unit (Fig. 5 numeral 610 virtual printer).

Yacoub fails to explicitly disclose an issuance unit adapted to issue a job in response to a user instruction.

Aiello et al, in the same field of endeavor of directing print jobs to printers in accordance with attributes needed for the job and the capabilities of a connected printer (Col. 2 lines 29-34), teaches an issuance unit adapted to issue a job in response to a user instruction (Col. 2 lines 25-39 wherein the user may "drag-and-drop" the print job to a selected printer. The method also prevents/inhibits drag-and-drop if attributes of the print job do not match that of the printer).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for information processing apparatus comprising an obtaining unit and an inhibition unit as disclosed by Yacoub to include an issuance unit adapted to issue a job in response to a user instruction as taught by Aiello et al for additional control over print jobs while providing a flexible, easy-to-use operator interface.

Yacoub fails to explicitly disclose the inhibition unit being adapted to, if at least one of the plural setting values of the job related to the user instruction does not satisfy a predetermined condition related to the plural setting values indicated by the function information obtained by the obtaining unit, inhibit issuance of the job by the issuance unit and wherein the inhibition unit

allows issuance of the job by the issuance unit, if the plural setting values of the job satisfy the predetermined condition.

Aiello et al teaches inhibiting issuance of the job by the issuance unit if at least one of the plural setting values of the job related to the user instruction does not satisfy a predetermined condition related to the "plural setting values indicated by the function information" (Col. 2 lines 37-39 wherein drag-and-drop is prevented if the printer's "set-up" is determined incompatible with the print job's "set-up". The respective "set-up" reads on setting values indicated by the function information as this term is used to describe the configuration or "attributes" of the printer and print job) and allows issuance of the job by the issuance unit, if the plural setting values of the job satisfy the predetermined condition (Col. 2 lines 29-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the inhibition unit as disclosed by Yacoub to be adapted to, if at least one of the plural setting values of the job related to the user instruction does not satisfy a predetermined condition related to the plural setting values indicated by the function information obtained by the obtaining unit, inhibit issuance of the job by the issuance unit as taught by Aiello et al to improve the invention as disclosed by Yacoub in a manner which aids in print job distribution and control. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that applying the known technique of inhibiting issuance of the print job to the printer as taught by Aiello would have yielded predictable results and would have improved the information processing apparatus of Yacoub in determining if and how to route print jobs more efficiently.

Regarding claim 70, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus according to Claim 69, wherein the function information obtained by the obtaining unit includes information indicating a job attribute range executable by the peripheral ("... speed can be variable and have many values from which the user can choose, such as slow, slower, fast, fastest or medium" Col. 5 lines 15. This indicates a "range" of one of the attributes of the printer), and further comprising a display unit (Fig. 5 numeral 640 user interface) adapted to distinguishably display the job attribute range on a user interface (Col. 11 lines 25-28; as mentioned before, the range of speed is an attribute that can be selected on the interface) provided in a control program for controlling the peripheral based on the obtained function information (Col. 11 line 31-36 wherein the preferences selected by the user are sent to the virtual printer which "controls" the "appropriate" printer to output the preferences selected. Col. 11 lines 3-6 wherein software (a control program) manages hardware within the system).

Regarding claim 71, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus according to Claim 69, wherein the obtaining unit obtains information indicating a function setting range executable by the peripheral ("... speed can be variable and have many values from which the user can choose, such as slow, slower, fast, fastest or medium" Col. 5 lines 15. This indicates a "range" of one of the attributes of the printer).

Regarding claim 73, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus according to Claim 69, wherein the obtaining unit obtains information indicating a function selectable in the

peripheral ("Virtual printer 610 receives other data, from the server 680 or a database in client 600, such as the capabilities of the printers..." Col. 11 line 46).

Regarding claim 75, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus according to Claim 69, wherein the obtaining unit obtains from the peripheral an attribute list indicating functions corresponding to one of a physical device control program, a logical device control program, a resource control program of the peripheral and a coordinate control program for coordination thereof ("Further, while some printers are capable of understanding one of the printer languages such as either Postscript or PCL but not both, a further print job preference may be the printer language which either the software/application used in generating the print job" at Col. 8 line 26. Indicating an attribute sent to the "virtual printer" for making determinations can include the language supported by the peripheral which is readable on a logical device control program; Fig. 4 shows the layout of a typical office suite having both laser and inkjet printing devices, indicating information obtained from the peripheral devices will include the type of printer which would be controlled by the client station. Therefore, physical device control programs would need to be acquired in order to print from both laser and inkjet printers located in the office setting).

Regarding claim 76, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus according to Claim 75, wherein the physical device control program includes at least one of a scanner control program that controls a scanner engine of the peripheral, a laser beam printer control program that controls a laser beam printer engine of the peripheral, and an ink jet printer control program

Art Unit: 2625

that controls an ink jet printer engine of the peripheral (see rejection of claim 75; Suggesting laser and inkjet printers are controlled).

Regarding claim 77, discloses an information processing apparatus according to Claim 75, wherein the logical device control program includes at least one of a print job control program that controls a laser beam primer control program, a print job control program that controls an ink jet primer control program, a print job control program that controls the laser beam printer control program and the ink jet printer control program, a scan job control program that controls a scanner control program, a copy job control program that controls the scanner control program and the laser beam primer control program, and a copy job control program that controls the scanner control program and the ink jet printer control program (see rejection of claim 75 wherein print job control programs, using either PCL or Postscript languages, are utilized to control the laser and inkjet printers).

Regarding claim 78, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus according to Claim 69, wherein the obtaining unit obtains the function information from the peripheral (Col. 5 lines 41-44 wherein the virtual printer will query...all printers present in...an office suite...").

Regarding claim 79, Yacoub discloses an information processing method for controlling via a communication medium a peripheral that processes a job which executes a predetermined service (see rejection of claims 69; apparatus implementing the method), the method comprising:

an obtaining step of obtaining, via the communication medium, function information that includes information indicating plural setting values executable by the peripheral (see rejection of claim 69);

an issuance step of issuing a job in response to a user instruction (see rejection of claim 69); and

an inhibition step of, if at least one of the plural setting values of the job related to the user instruction does not satisfy a predetermined condition related to the plural setting values indicated by the function information obtained by the obtaining unit, inhibiting issuance of the job in the issuance step (see rejection of claim 69),

wherein the inhibiting step includes allowing issuance of the job in the issuance step, if the plural setting values of the job satisfy the predetermined condition (see rejection of claim 69).

Regarding claim 80, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to Claim 79, wherein the function information obtained in the obtaining step includes information indicating a job attribute range executable by the peripheral, and wherein the method further comprises a step of distinguishably displaying on a display unit the job attribute range on a user interface provided in a control program for controlling the peripheral based on the obtained function information (see rejection of claim 70).

Regarding claim 81, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to Claim 79, wherein the obtaining step includes obtaining information indicating a function setting range executable by the peripheral (see rejection of claim 71).

Regarding claim 83, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to Claim 79, wherein the obtaining step includes obtaining information indicating a function selectable in the peripheral (see rejection of claim 73).

Regarding claim 85, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to Claim 79, wherein the obtaining step includes obtaining from the peripheral an attribute list indicating functions corresponding to one of a physical device control program, a logical device control program, a resource control program of the peripheral and a coordinate control program for coordination thereof (see rejection of claim 75).

Regarding claim 86, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to Claim 85, wherein the physical device control program includes at least one of a scanner control program that controls a scanner engine of the peripheral, a laser beam primer control program that controls a laser beam primer engine of the peripheral, and an ink jet primer control program that controls an ink jet printer engine of the peripheral (see rejection of claim 76).

Regarding claim 87, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to Claim 85, wherein the logical device control program includes at least one of a print job control program that controls a laser beam primer control program, a print job control program that controls an ink jet primer control program, a print job control program that controls the laser beam primer control program and the ink jet printer control program, a scan job control program

that controls a scanner control program, a copy job control program that controls the scanner control program and the laser beam printer control program, and a copy job control program that controls the scanner control program and the ink jet printer control program (see rejection of claim 77).

Regarding claim 88, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to Claim 79, wherein the obtaining step includes obtaining the function information from the peripheral (see rejection of claim 78).

Regarding claim 89, Yacoub discloses a computer-readable storage medium, storing, in executable form, a program for causing an information processing apparatus to control via a communication medium a peripheral that processes a job, which executes a predetermined service, the program comprising obtaining code, issuance code and inhibiting code for implementing the method as described in claim 79 above (Col. 11 lines 16-19 wherein the virtual printer can be a combination of software and hardware which reads on a storage medium storing the program to implement the method as rejected in claim 79 above).

5. Claims 74 and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacoub in view of Aiello et al as applied to claim 69, and further in view of Shee-Yen Tan et al (US 5978560).

Regarding claim 74, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus according to claim 69, wherein said obtaining unit obtains from the peripheral an attribute list indicating functions of the peripheral ("Virtual printer 610 receives other data, from the server 680 or a database in client 600, such as the capabilities of the printers..." Col. 11 line 46).

Yacoub fails to disclose or suggest the obtaining unit obtains a value of an attribute by designating an ID of the attribute in the attribute list.

Tan et al, in the same field of endeavor of distributing job requests to peripheral devices according to retrieved attributes (Col. 1 lines 44-47, Tan et al), teaches obtaining a value of an attribute by designating an ID of the attribute in the attribute list (Fig. 4 shows the attributes listed in the database 600 are each given an ID (MCJP, NJOD, NCJ...) which are provided a value (1, 5, 10...). These values are received by the supervisor to "load balance" print jobs described at Col. 5 lines 31-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the apparatus and method as disclosed by Yacoub wherein the obtaining unit obtains from a peripheral an attribute list indicating functions of the peripheral to utilize the teachings of Tan et al wherein a value of an attribute is obtained by designating an ID of the attribute in the attribute list to offer a more uniform indicator for the capabilities of the peripheral devices.

Regarding claim 84, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to Claim 79, wherein said obtaining step includes obtaining from the peripheral an attribute list

indicating functions of the peripheral, and obtaining a value of an attribute by designating an ID of the attribute in the attribute list (see rejection of claim 74).

6. Claims 72, 82, 90 and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacoub in view of Aiello et al as applied to claim 69 above, and further in view of Koichi Murakami (EP 0529692 A2).

Regarding claim 72, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus according to claim 71 further comprising:

a determination unit (see rejection of claim 69;virtual printer 610) adapted to determine whether an inhibition attribute is set for the job (see rejection of claim 69 wherein acquiring the capabilities of the printer gives the attributes not supported by the printer, by default); and

wherein the inhibition unit inhibits issuance of the job by the issuance unit (see rejection of claim 69).

Yacoub fails to explicitly disclose a discrimination unit adapted to discriminate whether a combination of attributes set for the job is inhibited, if the determination unit determines that an inhibition attribute is set for the job and inhibiting issuance of the job if the discrimination unit discriminates that a combination of attributes set for the job is inhibited.

Murakami, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a discrimination unit adapted to discriminate whether a combination of attributes set for the job is inhibited if the determination unit determines that an inhibition attribute is set for the job (Col. 16 lines 36-50 wherein there must exist a “discrimination unit” adapted to determine the stapling capability corresponding to

the number of sheets counted when a predetermined number of sheets will inhibit stapling.

Stapling capability to number of sheets reads on a "combination of attributes" which would inhibit printing if the count exceeded a predetermined number), and inhibiting issuance of the job if the discrimination unit discriminates that a combination of attributes set for the job is inhibited (Col. 16 lines 47-52 wherein issuance of the job is prohibited when the number of sheets exceeds a predetermined number).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the information processing apparatus as disclosed by Yacoub to utilize the process and accompanying unit as taught by Murakami wherein a discrimination unit adapted to discriminate whether a combination of attributes set for the job is inhibited if the determination unit determines that an inhibition attribute is set for the job and inhibiting issuance of the job if the discrimination unit discriminates that a combination of attributes set for the job is inhibited because the modification to use the discrimination unit as taught by Murakami would have constituted the mere arrangement of prior art elements with each performing the same function it had been known to perform, the combination yielding no more than one would expect from such an arrangement. Clearly utilizing the range of acceptable sheets which would allow stapling as taught by Murakami would have provided the predictable results of sending the predetermined number of sheets required for stapling to be possible, along with additional attributes of the printer, to the determination unit as disclosed by Yacoub to evaluate whether the print job should be issued.

Regarding claim 82, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to Claim 81, wherein the information indicating the function setting range is expressed with a combination of attributes for which a job setting is inhibited (see rejection of claim 72).

Regarding claim 90, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus according to claim 69.

Yacoub fails to disclose wherein the setting values of a job include a setting value as to a number of print sheets and a setting value as to a finisher device of the peripheral, and wherein the inhibition unit inhibits issuance of the job if the setting value as to the number of print sheets exceeds a predetermined value.

Murakami, in the same field of endeavor of print job finishing, teaches wherein a setting value of a job includes a setting value as to a number of print sheets (Col. 16 lines 47-48 wherein the count of the originals is taken) and a setting value as to a finisher device of the peripheral (Col. 16 lines 47-48 wherein a setting value for a finisher device has to be determined in order to compare the count of the originals), and wherein the issuance of the job is inhibited if the setting value as to the number of print sheets exceeds a predetermined value (Col. 16 lines 51-52 wherein the job may be prohibited if the count or the originals exceeds the devices finishing capabilities).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the information processing apparatus as disclosed by Yacoub to utilize the obtaining unit for obtaining a number of print sheets and a setting value as to a finisher device of a peripheral and wherein the issuance of the job is inhibited if the setting value as to the number

Art Unit: 2625

of print sheets exceeds a predetermined value as taught by Murakami to avoid possible staple jams from stapler being over charged or incurring any other damage to a finishing device due to excessive use.

Regarding claim 91, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to claim 79, wherein the setting values of a job include a setting value as to a number of print sheets and a setting value as to a finisher device of the peripheral, and wherein the inhibiting step inhibits issuance of the job if the setting value as to the number of print sheets exceeds a predetermined value (see rejection of claim 90).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 69, 79 and 89 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMARES WASHINGTON whose telephone number is (571) 270-1585. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday: 7:30am-5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2625

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, King Poon can be reached on (571) 272-7440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/King Y. Poon/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Jamares Washington/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/J. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

March 25, 2009